

## Peer Review Report

# Review Report on Morphological model for erosion prediction of India's largest braided river using MIKE 21C model

Original Research, Earth Sci. Syst. Soc.

Reviewer: Shehnaj Pathan

Submitted on: 04 May 2023

Article DOI: 10.3389/esss.2024.10075

### EVALUATION

#### **Q 1** Please summarize the main findings of the study.

The main findings by the author are found reasonable and as a whole a good details manuscript.

#### **Q 2** Please highlight the limitations and strengths.

There are many limitations in the paper.

1. As the manuscript is not in a standard pattern or format, as it should be. Therefore, the format of writing of the manuscript should be revised as a whole.
2. The language of the paper is not up to the mark.
3. The format of all tables should be modified should check other published article formats. Units written in the tables should be uniform pattern
4. The writings of the whole manuscript should be uniform throughout.
5. In some parts of the manuscript, there are many short-forms, you should specify every abbreviations at the start first.
6. Spelling, sentence making should be checked and improved throughout

#### **Q 3** Please comment on the methods, results and data interpretation. If there are any objective errors, or if the conclusions are not supported, you should detail your concerns.

1. Objectives should be written in standard language, check other published articles
2. Literature review should be revised, more works related to the Brahmaputra river erosion, sediment problems should be cited (eg. Pathan, S. A., & Sil, B. S. (2022). Rainfall Induced Soil Erosion and Sediment Yield Assessment in Upper Brahmaputra River Basin,.Borah, D. K. (2022). The Brahmaputra River Flooding, Erosion, Modeling for Sustainable Solutions, etc. ).
3. Too much self-citation is used by author in literature part. The author should mention other citations related to modeling of morphological characteristics as well as in some other braided rivers around the world.
4. The authors should add future scope and limitations of the work (if any) in conclusion part.
5. Why can't the authors use other methods for the analysis. This should be mentioned in introduction section.

#### **Q 4** Check List

Is the English language of sufficient quality?

No.

Is the quality of the figures and tables satisfactory?

No.

Does the reference list cover the relevant literature adequately and in an unbiased manner?

No.

Are the statistical methods valid and correctly applied? (e.g. sample size, choice of test)

Yes.

If relevant, are the methods sufficiently documented to allow replication studies?

Yes.

Are the data underlying the study available in either the article, supplement, or deposited in a repository? (Sequence/expression data, protein/molecule characterizations, annotations, and taxonomy data are required to be deposited in public repositories prior to publication)

Yes.

Does the study adhere to ethical standards including ethics committee approval and consent procedure?

Yes.

If relevant, have standard biosecurity and institutional safety procedures been adhered to?

Yes.

**Q 5** Please provide your detailed review report to the editor and authors (including any comments on the Q4 Check List):

I would recommend a major revision. Whole manuscript should be revised.

1. Objectives should be written in standard language, check other published articles
2. Literature review should be revised, more works related to the Brahmaputra river erosion, sediment problems should be cited (eg. Pathan, S. A., & Sil, B. S. (2022). Rainfall Induced Soil Erosion and Sediment Yield Assessment in Upper Brahmaputra River Basin,.Borah, D. K. (2022). The Brahmaputra River Flooding, Erosion, Modeling for Sustainable Solutions, etc. ).
3. Too much self-citation is used by author in literature part. The author should mention other citations related to modeling of morphological characteristics as well as in some other braided rivers around the world.
4. The authors should add future scope and limitations of the work (if any) in conclusion part.
5. Why can't the authors use other methods for the analysis. This should be mentioned in introduction section.
6. As the manuscript is not in a standard pattern or format, as it should be. Therefore, the format of writing of the manuscript should be revised as a whole.
7. The language of the paper is not up to the mark.
8. The format of all tables should be modified should check other published article formats. Units written in the tables should be uniform pattern
9. The writings of the whole manuscript should be uniform throughout.
10. In some parts of the manuscript, there are many short-forms, you should specify every abbreviations at the start first.
11. The manuscript should be well organised. And should be well written so that the readers can understand easily.

**QUALITY ASSESSMENT**

<b>Q 6</b> Originality	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Q 7</b> Rigor	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Q 8</b> Significance to the field	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Q 9</b> Interest to a general audience	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Q 10</b> Quality of the writing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Q 11</b> Overall quality of the study	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>